

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALI MOHAMED,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

TRIDENT SEAFOODS CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendant(s).

NO. C09-1353MJP

ORDER ON MOTION TO AMEND
SCHEDULING ORDER

The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed a Stipulated Motion to Amend Scheduling Order Regarding Disclosure of Expert Testimony and Completion of Discovery (Dkt. No. 9), and all attached declarations and exhibits, makes the following ruling:

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is DENIED without prejudice to re-submit the request after addressing the concerns expressed below.


The parties claim, in the Stipulation which accompanies their proposed motion, that the “amended briefing schedule would make the noting date [for dispositive motions] 7/27/10. . .” *Id.*, p. 3. In fact, the proposed schedule submitted the parties contains the following description referring to the 7/27/10 date: “All dispositive motions must be *filed* by and noted on the motion calendar not later than the fourth Friday thereafter. . .” (*id.*, p. 2; emphasis supplied). This means the motions would actually note on August 20, 2010,¹ which the Court does not find an acceptable amount of time prior to trial.

¹ The amended 7/27/10 dispositive motions filing date also contains a parenthetical declaration that “(All dispositive motions shall be noted on the motion calendar no later than the *third* Friday thereafter)” (*id.*, p. 2; emphasis supplied), which is a misstatement of the filing timeline as set out in CR7(d).

1 If the parties wish to submit a revised stipulation which creates a *noting* date for dispositive
2 motions which is prior to or on July 23, 2010 (i.e., a filing deadline prior to June 25, 2010), the Court
3 will reconsider the request.

4 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

5 Dated: March 18, 2010

6 
7
8 Marsha J. Pechman
U.S. District Judge